



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

MEDTRONIC, INC.  
710 MEDTRONIC PARKWAY NE  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55432-9924

MAILED

JUL 01 2009

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :  
Edwin G. Duffin, et. al. :  
Application No. 10/601,476 :  
Filed: June 24, 2003 :  
Attorney Docket No. P0009797.00 :

ON PETITION

This is a decision on the renewed petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed on February 19, 2009, to revive the above-identified application.

In response to the Decision mailed on December 2, 2008, petitioner submits the present renewed petition along with an amendment and \$130 for a one month extension of time filed on February 19, 2009.

The present petition is not signed by an attorney of record. However, in accordance with 37 CFR 1.34(a), the signature of Carol F. Barry appearing on the petition shall constitute a representation to the United States Patent and Trademark Office that she is authorized to represent the particular party on whose behalf she acts.

The petition is DISMISSED.

A grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by: (1) the required reply, unless previously filed; (2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m); (3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional; and (4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required by 37 CFR 1.137(d). Where there is a question as to whether either the abandonment or the delay in filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.137 was unintentional, the Commissioner may require additional information. See MPEP 711.03(c)(III)(C) and (D). The instant petition lacks item(s) (1).

The proposed reply required for consideration of a petition to revive must be a Notice of Appeal (and appeal fee required by 37 CFR 41.20(b)(2)), an amendment that *prima facie* places the application in condition for allowance, a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and submission (37 CFR 1.114), or the filing of a continuing application under 37 CFR 1.53(b). See MPEP 711.03(c)(II)(A)(2). Since the

amendment submitted on February 19, 2009, does not *prima facie* place the application in condition for allowance, the reply required must be a Notice of Appeal (and appeal fee), RCE, or the filing of a continuing application under 37 CFR 1.53(b). A courtesy copy of the Advisory Action is being mailed with this decision on petition.

Any request for reconsideration of this decision must be submitted within **TWO (2) MONTHS** from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b)." This is **not** a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 704.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail: Mail Stop PETITION  
Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand: U. S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Petitions  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

The centralized facsimile number is (571) 273-8300.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to the undersigned at  
(571) 272-3226

  
Andrea Smith  
Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions

Enclosure: Courtesy Copy of the Advisory Action

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
10/601,476	DUFFIN ET AL.	
<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
MICHAEL KAHELIN	3762	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 19 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
  - a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
  - b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
  - (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
  - (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 26-28.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-9.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 21-25.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Michael Kahelin/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3762

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments to claims 7 and 8 modify the scope of the claim and require further search and consideration as the deflectable members now deflect from a header instead of from the connector bore .

**1.**

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argued that the physical incorporation of Sluetz (Re. 31,990) and Doan (US 7,031,774) would not result in the claimed invention, but merely a header with a sliding connector plugged into the header that still only allows for polarity reversal, and the substitution would result in four contacts (as in Doan) having to be somehow wired to the two electrodes of Sluetz. Applicant further argued that the Advisory Action of 5/2/2008 improperly recast the rejection present in the Final Rejection of 2/21/2008 by "cherry pick[ing]" aspects of Doan to modify Sluetz in such a way to constitute hindsight reconstruction, and that Doan further teaches away from the combination because Doan's boot is movable relative to the lead body. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's argument that various features of Doan and Sluetz may not be compatible, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). The Examiner maintains that, taken as a whole, an artisan of ordinary skill would have recognized that modifying Sluetz' header with the lead/connector configuration of Doan would render predictable results as both teachings involve selecting distal electrode configuration via axial placement of the proximal connector. Contrary to Applicant's assertion, this teaching of Doan has not been "recast," but was set forth in the Final Office Action of 2/21/2008 for the purpose of allowing stimulation location to be adjusted after final implantation of the lead. Lastly, the Examiner respectfully disagrees that Doan's electrode selection system used in a boot "teaches away" from use in a header. Just because Doan teaches a selection system used in a boot is not a teaching of not using the system in a header. Doan is merely silent on the matter.